UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/756,641	01/03/2001	David Proulx	0007056-0062/P5334NP/ARG	7529

58328 7590 06/29/2007

SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
FOR SUN MICROSYSTEMS
P.O. BOX 061080
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER	
STORK, KYLE R	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/29/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/756,641	PROULX ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kyle R. Stork	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 May 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *28-48* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *28-48* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This final office action is in response to the amendment filed 8 May 2007.

2. Claims 28-48 are pending. Claims 28, 35, and 42 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 28-29, 33, 35-36, 40, 42-43, and 47 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickmore et al. (US 6875102, provisional filed 7 April 1998, hereafter Bickmore).

As per independent claim 28, Bickmore discloses a method in a data processing system for converting a word processing document to a compact word processing document format, the method comprising the steps of:

- Extracting style information from the word processing document , the style information including a paragraph style gallery and a text style gallery (column 8, lines 53-65: Here, the style and text for each element)
- Extracting text from the word processing document (column 8, lines 53-65: Here, the text of the page is determined and sub-divided into a plurality of smaller sub-pages)

- Storing the text and run information in a second record, wherein the run information describes locations in the text where style information is to be applied (column 8, lines 53-65: Here, each sub-page is stored and contains the style information originally associated with the text)

Bickmore fails to specifically disclose storing the style information in a first record. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention that style information, such as styles defined by a language grammar, is stored in a separate record allowing many instances of objects to apply the style simultaneously. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have stored the style information separately, allowing many objects to reference the style information simultaneously.

As per dependent claims 29, Bickmore discloses wherein the method further comprises determining whether the text will fit in the second record, and if the text will not fit in the second record, storing a first portion of the text and a first portion of the run information in the second record, and a second portion of the text and a second portion of the run information in the third record (column 8, lines 53-65).

As per dependent claim 33, Bickmore discloses the ability to store text (column 8, lines 53-65). Bickmore fails to specifically disclose the text being multi-byte characters. However, it was well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention that text may be multi-byte characters, containing both the character and an offset, allowing for use of an extended character set such as Kanji. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the use

of multi-byte characters with Bickmore, since it would have allowed a user to represent more characters.

As per independent claims 35 and 42, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 28. Claims 35 and 42 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 36 and 43, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 29. Claims 36 and 43 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 40 and 47, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 33. Claims 40 and 47 are similarly rejected.

5. Claims 30-32, 37-39, and 44-46 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickmore and further in view of Smith et al. (US 5212770, patented 18 May 1993, hereafter Smith).

As per dependent claims 30, Bickmore discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 28, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Bickmore fails to specifically disclose wherein the run descriptor includes a style name, an offset, and a length. However, Smith discloses a run descriptor including a style name, an offset, and a length (column 17, lines 16-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Smith with Bickmore, since it would have allowed a user to specify an exact location on a page for the display of text (Smith: column 17, lines 16-47).

As per dependent claim 31, Bickmore and Smith disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 30, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Bickmore fails to

specifically disclose wherein the style name references a style name in the paragraph and text galleries. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention that style information, such as styles defined by a language grammar, are referenced in order for the style to be applied to text. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined this well known information with Bickmore, since it would have allowed a user to merely reference the style instead of completely redefining the style each time the user wished to generate text in the style.

As per dependent claim 32, Bickmore and Smith disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 30, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Smith further discloses wherein the offset indicates a location in the text (column 17, lines 16-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Smith with Bickmore, since it would have allowed a user to specify an exact location on a page for the display of text (Smith: column 17, lines 16-47).

As per dependent claims 37 and 44, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 30. Claims 37 and 44 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 38 and 45, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 31. Claims 38 and 45 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 39 and 46, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 32. Claims 39 and 46 are similarly rejected.

6. Claims 34, 41, and 48 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bickmore and further in view of Kursh (US 2001/0032076, provisional file 7 December 1999).

As per dependent claim 34, Bickmore discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 28, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Bickmore fails so specifically disclose a record based storage system on a PDA. However, Kursh discloses a record based storage system on a PDA (paragraph 0032). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Kursh with Bickmore, since it would have allowed a user to review and modify data stored within the database (paragraph 0032).

As per dependent claims 41 and 48, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 34. Claims 41 and 48 are similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

7. As per independent claims 28, 35, and 42, the applicant argues that Bickmore fails to disclose or suggest extracting a paragraph style gallery and a text style gallery from a word processing document (page 6). The examiner respectfully disagrees. Bickmore discloses extracting the style information from an HTML page in via an Index Segment transform (column 8, lines 41-52). The Index Segment transform partitions the page along logical boundaries, such as paragraphs (column 8, lines 41-52). This is an extraction of the paragraph style, in that the page is sub-divided logically based upon the paragraphs boundaries. Bickmore further extracts the style information for output

data, such as text (column 8, lines 53-65). Although the Index Segment transform attempts to maintain as much formatting information as possible, it is still extracted when creating the index page (column 8, lines 53-65). Therefore, Bickmore appears to teach the claimed limitations.

The remaining arguments are based upon claims 28, 35, and 42. These arguments are similarly not persuasive.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kyle R Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

krs

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER